

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 22-41 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicant AMENDS claims 22, 30, and 39-41 and CANCELS claim 42.

Claim 41 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 41 has been amended to recite the features of claim 42, as was suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Claims 22, 23, 28, 36-39, 41, and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Imura (JP 2000-238552). Claims 24-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imura in view of Hirasuna (JP 11-099852). Claims 27 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imura in view of Iwashita (JP 2004-042684). Claims 30, 31, 35, and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imura in view of Kolpasky et al. (U.S. 7,474,309). Claims 32 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imura in view of Kolpasky et al., and further in view of Hirasuna. Claim 34 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imura and Kolpasky et al., and further in view of Iwashita.

As indicated above, Applicant has canceled claim 42.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of claims 22-41.

Claim 22 has been amended to recite:

An instrument panel image display device, installed on an apparatus so as to display an instrument panel image, said instrument panel image display device comprising:

a display arranged to display the instrument panel image including a plurality of gauge images, by which internal and external information of the apparatus is provided to a user, said instrument panel image is displayed in accordance with a plurality of image data which generates the plurality of gauge images, wherein each of said plurality of image data individually generates one of said plurality of gauge images; and

**an image data changing section arranged to change one of said plurality of image data into another image data, said another image data generating another gauge image.** (emphasis added)

Applicant's claims 39 and 41 recite features and method steps that are similar to the features recited in Applicant's claim 22, including the above-emphasized features.

With the unique combination and arrangement of features recited in Applicant's claim 22, including the feature of "an image data changing section arranged to change one of said plurality of image data into another image data, said another image data generating another gauge image," Applicant has been able to provide an instrument panel image display device which allows an instrument panel image to be more freely selected with a visibility of gauges disposed thereon taken into consideration (see, for example, paragraph [0008] of Applicant's specification).

The Examiner alleged that Imura teaches all of the features recited in Applicant's claim 22, including "an image data changing section (16) arranged to change said image data, which generates the gauge image, into image data, which generates another gauge image (see paragraph 18, lines 2-5)."

Applicant has amended claim 22 to recite the feature of "an image data changing section arranged to change one of said plurality of image data into another image data, said another image data generating another gauge image." Support for this feature is found, for example, in paragraphs [0056]-[0058], [0132], and [0133] of Applicant's specification and in Figs. 9(a)-9(c) of Applicant's drawings. Applicant has also amended claims 39 and 41 to recite similar features and method steps.

Imura does not teach or suggest this feature or method steps.

Imura teaches a display device for a vehicle in which the arrangement of gauges A and B on the display device can be changed, as is discussed in paragraphs [0030] and [0031] and shown in Figs. 8(a), 8(b), 9(a), and 9(b) of Imura. However, Imura does not independently change the individual gauges A and B. Rather, Imura replaces one predetermined display image that includes gauges A and B in a first arrangement with another predetermined display image that includes gauges A and B in a second arrangement, as shown in Figs. 8(a), 8(b), 9(a), and 9(b) of Imura.

In comparing Fig. 8(a) with Fig. 8(b) and Fig. 9(a) with Fig. 9(b) of Imura, the replacing of gauge A or B with another gauge A or B is obtained by replacing the entire display image. The data for generating the gauge A or B in Figs. 8(a) and 9(a) of Imura is not independently changed with different data for generating the gauge A or B in Figs. 8(b) and 9(b) of Imura. To change the data for generating the gauge A but not the data generating the gauge B in Imura, it is necessary to prepare in advance an entire display image having the same gauge B, but with another gauge A.

The present claimed invention is directed to a display in which the data for generating a single gauge image can be independently changed, without having to change the data for generating the entire display image. Therefore, the presently claimed invention achieves the ability to change only a specific individual gauge image without having to replace the other gauge images and without having to prepare in advance data for generating the entire display image.

Thus, because Imura teaches changing all of the gauges A and B on the display at the same time, Imura does not teach or suggest the feature of “an image data changing section arranged to change one of said plurality of image data into another image data, said another image data generating another gauge image” as recited in Applicant’s claim 22 and similarly recited in Applicant’s claims 39 and 41.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 22, 39, and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Imura.

The Examiner relied upon Hirasuna and Iwashita et al. to allegedly cure the deficiencies of Imura. However, Hirasuna and Iwashita et al. clearly fail to teach or suggest the feature of “an image data changing section arranged to change one of said plurality of image data into another image data, said another image data generating another gauge image” as recited in Applicant’s claim 22 and similarly recited in Applicant’s claims 39 and 41. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Hirasuna and Iwashita et al. fail to cure the deficiencies of Imura described above.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Imura, Hirasuna, and Iwashita et al.,

applied alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the unique combination and arrangement of elements recited in Applicant's claim 22, 29, and 41.

Claim 30 has been amended to recite:

An instrument panel image display device, installed on an apparatus so as to display an instrument panel image, said instrument panel image display device comprising:

a display arranged to display the instrument panel image including a gauge image, by which internal and external information is provided to a user, and a background image, which serves as a background of the gauge image, in accordance with image data that generates said gauge image and image data that generates the background image; and

**an image data changing section arranged to change said image data which generates said background image into another image data, said another image data generating another background image.** (emphasis added)

Applicant's claim 40 recites features and method steps that are similar to the features recited in Applicant's claim 30, including the above-emphasized features.

With the unique combination and arrangement of features recited in Applicant's claim 30, including the feature of "an image data changing section arranged to change said image data which generates said background image into another image data, said another image data generating another background image," Applicant has been able to provide an instrument panel image display device which allows an instrument panel image to be more freely selected with a visibility of gauges disposed thereon taken into consideration (see, for example, paragraph [0008] of Applicant's specification).

The Examiner alleged that the combination of Imura and Kolpasky et al. teaches all of the features recited in Applicant's claim 30. More specifically, the Examiner alleged that Imura teaches "an image data changing section (16) arranged to change said image data, which generates the gauge image, into image data, which generates another gauge image (see paragraph 18, lines 2-5)." The Examiner admitted, "Imura fails to teach that the display also displays background image data." To remedy this deficiency in Imura, the Examiner relied upon Kolpasky et al. alleging, "Kolpasky et al. teaches that a vehicle image display device has both image data (58) and background data (74) which are displayed at the same time on different

parts of the display (see column 4, lines 41 -42 and 52-57).” Thus, the Examiner concluded, “It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention that if image data is able to be processed and displayed in the manner taught by Imura, and that multiple types of data are able to be displayed at once, as taught by Kolpasky et al., that the multiple types of data would each be able to be displayed and changed to provide both an image and a background on the display.”

Applicant has amended claim 30 to recite the feature of “an image data changing section arranged to change said image data which generates said background image into another image data, said another image data generating another background image.” Support for this feature is found, for example, in paragraphs [0017]-[0019] of Applicant’s specification. Applicant has also amended claim 40 to recite a similar method step.

Neither Imura nor Kolpasky et al. teaches or suggests this feature or method step.

Imura teaches a display device for a vehicle in which the arrangement of gauges A and B on the display device can be changed, as is discussed in paragraphs [0030] and [0031] and shown in Figs. 8(a), 8(b), 9(a), and 9(b) of Imura. However, as discussed above, the Examiner admitted, “Imura fails to teach that the display also displays background image data.”

Kolpasky et al. teaches a display apparatus for a hybrid drive vehicle that includes screen 54 with a plurality of icons 58A, 58B, and 58C and visual elements 82A, 82B, and 82C, as shown in Figs. 2-5 and discussed in column 4, lines 12-42 of Kolpasky et al. However, column 4, lines 41 and 42 of Kolpasky et al. state that the screen 54 displays a uniform background 74. This uniform background is necessary so that all of the icons 58A, 58B, and 58C and visual elements 82A, 82B, and 82C can be clearly distinguished. There is no teaching or suggestion anywhere in Kolpasky et al. of changing the background 74. Accordingly, Kolpasky et al. clearly fails to teach or suggest the feature of “an image data changing section arranged to change said image data which generates said background image into another image data, said another image data generating another background image” as recited in Applicant’s claim 30 and similarly recited in Applicant’s claim 40.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 30 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imura in view of Kolpasky et al.

The Examiner relied upon Hirasuna and Iwashita et al. to allegedly cure the deficiencies of Imura and Kolpasky et al. However, Hirasuna and Iwashita et al. clearly fail to teach or suggest the feature of “an image data changing section arranged to change said image data which generates said background image into another image data, said another image data generating another background image” as recited in Applicant’s claims 30 and similarly recited in Applicant’s claim 40. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Hirasuna and Iwashita et al. fail to cure the deficiencies of Imura and Kolpasky et al. described above.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Imura, Kolpasky et al., Hirasuna, and Iwashita et al., applied alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the unique combination and arrangement of elements recited in Applicant’s claim 30 and 40.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 22, 30, 39, and 40 are allowable. Claims 23-29 and 31-38 depend upon claims 22 and 30 are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that claims 22 and 30 are allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions the Commissioner for a ONE-month extension of time, extending to September 28, 2009 (September 26, 2009 falls on a Saturday), the period for response to the Office Action dated May 26, 2009.

Application No. 10/598,110  
September 25, 2009  
Reply to the Office Action dated May 26, 2009  
Page 13 of 13

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 25, 2009

/Erik Preston #64,733/  
Attorneys for Applicant

Joseph R. Keating  
Registration No. 37,368

**KEATING & BENNETT, LLP**  
1800 Alexander Bell Drive, Suite 200  
Reston, VA 20191  
Telephone: (571) 313-7440  
Facsimile: (571) 313-7421

Peter Medley  
Registration No. 56,125

Erik Preston  
Registration No. 64,733